

REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 5-12, 31, and 35-79 are pending and stand rejected.

Claims 1, 31, 42, 48, 61, and 67 are amended herein.

Accordingly, claims 1-3, 5-12, 31, and 35-79 are pending upon entry of this amendment.

Based on the above Amendment and the following Remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections, and withdraw them.

Response to Rejections Under 35 USC 102(e) and 35 USC 103(a)

Claims 1-3, 10, 12, 35-36, 40-46, 49-50, 52, 53, 61-65, 68-69, 71, and 72 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Owens, U.S. Patent Application Publication 2007/0022155. Claims 5-9, 11, 31, 38-39, 47-48, 54-60, 66-67, and 73-79 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Owens in view of Belfiore, U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0059425. Claims 37, 51, and 70 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Owens in view of Bates, U.S. Patent 6,873,982. These rejections are traversed and discussed together for purposes of clarity.

Independent claim 1, as amended, recites a method for capturing event data associated with a plurality of different types of articles generated by a plurality of different client applications:

storing a plurality of different event schemas, each event schema associated with at least one of the types of articles **and defining a format for storing event data**;
detecting an event, the event including a user interaction with an article;
responsive to the event, determining an event schema associated with the type of the article; and

storing, in a data store, event data identifying the event and the article **using the format defined by the event schema associated with the type of the article.**

First, Owens does not disclose or suggest at least the claimed feature of, “storing a plurality of different event schemas, each event schema ... defining a format for storing event data.” Fundamentally, Owens is not directed towards the storage of event data associated with different types of articles. Instead, Owens discloses a method for integrating enterprise applications with desktop applications (e.g., Excel™, Word™, etc.). In Owens, when a user interacts with a desktop object such as a spreadsheet or document, the operating system invokes an action handler to manage some behavior of the desktop application. *See* Owens [0003], [0030]. An action handler is merely a policy defined by an enterprise application to manage a behavior of a desktop application. *See* Owens [0011], [0031], [0048], [0059].

As such, even if Owens’s action handlers could be interpreted as representing schemas, the action handlers disclosed by Owens do not define a format for storing event data as claimed, but instead define a behavior to be taken when the action handler is invoked. At best, some action handlers communicate with the enterprise application via conventional XML messages. *See* Owens [0039], [0044]. However, these messages are for communicating to the enterprise application, not for storing event data. Thus XML is being used as a format for a network communication, not as an event schema for storing data in an event schema.

Second, given that Owens does not contemplate the storage of event data or event schemas that define a format for storing event data, it logically follows that Owens also does not disclose or suggest at least the claimed feature of, “storing, in a data store, event data identifying

the event and the article using the format defined by the event schema associated with the type of the article.”

Belfiore does not remedy the above-described deficiencies of Owens. Rather, Belfiore describes a platform for improving interactions within a distributed computing network. *See* Belfiore [0015]. Belfiore mentions events, but in the context of driving communications and other activities within the network. *See* Belfiore [0020], [0119]. Hence, although Belfiore describes a variety of schemas, like Owens they are for data communication – not storage of event data. *See* Belfiore [0018]. Accordingly, Belfiore does not describe schemas that define a format for storing event data. Indeed, the word “event” does not appear in the section of Belfiore regarding schemas. *See* Belfiore [0067]-[0089]. Thus, Belfiore does not disclose or suggest at least the claimed features of “storing a plurality of different event schemas, each event schema ... defining a format for storing event data” or “storing, in a data store, event data identifying the event and the article using the format defined by the event schema associated with the type of the article,” which were shown above to be absent from Owens. Accordingly, Owens and Belfiore do not disclose or suggest the claimed invention.

Bates also does not remedy the above-described deficiencies of Owens and Belfiore, nor does the Examiner assert that it does. Rather, Bates is cited merely to show the indexing of search results in a database. Bates does not disclose or suggest at least the claimed features of “storing a plurality of different event schemas, each event schema ... defining a format for storing event data” or “storing, in a data store, event data identifying the event and the article using the format defined by the event schema associated with the type of the article,” which were shown above to be absent from Owens and Belfiore.

Independent claims 42 and 61 recite similar features as those recited in claim 1. Hence, based on the arguments advanced above, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 42, and 61 are patentably distinguishable over Owens, Belfiore, and Bates, alone or in combination, and request their allowance. The dependent claims incorporate the limitations of their respective base claims and are allowable for at least the same reasons.

The Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney if it would be beneficial to further advance the prosecution of the application.

Respectfully submitted,
MIHAI FLORIN IONESCU ET AL.

Dated: November 12, 2008

By: /Robert R. Sachs/

Robert R. Sachs, Reg. No. 42,120
Attorney for Applicants
Fenwick & West LLP
Silicon Valley Center
801 California Street
Mountain View, CA 94041
Tel.: (415) 875-2410
Fax: (415) 281-1350
Email: rsachs@fenwick.com